

1964

gave elaborate protection to suspects. In the first year, according to the New York Times, convictions for drug peddling dropped 33 percent. During this same year 2,525 New York City police officers were assaulted either by individuals or mobs.

"No wonder no honest citizen wants to venture into Central Park after dark unless he's in the center of a hollow square of Marines.

"In the decade from 1950 to 1960 the American crime rate increased 98 percent while the population was going up 18 percent.

"It is time that decent Americans began to yell bloody murder. The robbers have been chasing the cops long enough. Let's turn the race around. Let's recognize that honest people have some rights, too, and that among these rights is the protection afforded by making it dangerous to rob, loot, maim, or murder them.

"What is needed is a new definition of 'reasonable cause.' Our courts are so deeply mired in technicalities that this may take new legislation. No legitimate human rights need be violated. The flood of confessed or redhanded criminals who walk out the courtroom doors smirking at the bailiffs represent not a triumph of law but it's idiotic failure."

COLLEGE REGISTRARS SUPPORT HARTKE EDUCATION BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, among the various organizations which have given official support to the Hartke college student assistance bill, S. 2490, one which is most closely concerned with the financial problems of students is the American Association of College Registrars and Admitting Officers. Dr. William F. McAloon of Pace College, Westchester, N.Y., is chairman of the group's Committee on Scholarships and Financial Aid. The committee has studied the bill and evaluated it. In a statement submitted to Chairman WAYNE MORSE of the Education Subcommittee on April 15, the college registrars and admitting officers officially state that they "fully support this bill."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include at this point in the Record portions of the statement of the Association.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIPS AND FINANCIAL AID OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS

Having read and thoroughly studied S. 2490, a bill to provide assistance for students in higher education by increasing the amount authorized under the National Education Act of 1958 and by establishing programs for scholarships, loan insurance, and work-study, the Committee on Scholarships and Student Aid of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers fully support this bill.

It is our belief that this bill will provide a greatly needed combination of ways whereby the youth of America may have a variety of means through which an opportunity for higher education can be made available to all those desiring such an opportunity.

The expansion of loans through the NDEA amendments as specified in the new bill with regard to institutional eligibility, and extending loan preference not only to prospective elementary and secondary school teachers but also to college and university

teachers are vital to the future of higher education.

The loan insurance feature of the bill will vastly expand loan funds available to students, particularly in States where no guaranteed loan plans now exist. It would eliminate the waste of vast sums of money paid in exceedingly high interest rates to organizations by parents and students who can ill afford to pay such rates.

We commend the sponsor of the bill for the inclusion of the scholarship provision and we feel that this incentive alone will vitalize all other parts of the bill.

The work-study section of the bill will, in our opinion, provide a new catalyst in the preparation for various careers and academically related work. It will make it possible for many institutions to fulfill an unmet need in providing new or expanded programs whereby support may be obtained by the institution and the trainee.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM F. McALOON, Ph. D.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR REV. DR. JOE Z TOWER, FATHER OF SENATOR TOWER, OF TEXAS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I rise to ask for permission to insert in the Record a resolution passed at the Texas Annual Conference of the South Central Jurisdiction of the Methodist Church honoring the father of one of our distinguished colleagues.

Rev. Dr. Joe Z Tower, the father of the junior Senator from Texas, has long been a tower of strength in the Methodist Church. He has served long and faithfully in the Texas Conference of the Methodist Church, as did his father before him. He has now retired, and the members of the conference council, meeting in session on May 13, 1964, expressed their appreciation with a standing ovation, and the passage of a resolution of praise and thanks for his long service in the cause of methodism.

Dr. Tower has been pastor of two churches in Houston, one in Jacksonville, Beaumont, Wichita Falls, Lufkin, and has served as district superintendent on the Tyler, Longview, Palestine and Texarkana districts. Upon his retirement, he was executive secretary of the Texas conference with offices in Houston. He is a member of the Board of Trustees of Southern Methodist University. He has many other honorary positions in methodism.

I might also note, Mr. President, that Dr. Tower's wife, the former Beryl Goodwin, is the daughter of a man who served 50 years in the Texas Conference of the Methodist Church. It is obvious that here is a family steeped in the history, the heritage, and the cause, of the Methodist Church.

Dr. Tower was born in Douglasville, Tex., the son of the Reverend and Mrs. C. A. Tower. He served in the hospital corps of the U.S. Navy through World War I. He received his college training at Baylor University College of Pharmacy, and Southern Methodist University. The doctor of divinity degree was conferred on him by Southern Methodist University in 1946. He is the father

of two children, our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas, and Mrs. J. B. Cochran of Fort Worth.

Mr. President, without objection, I would like to enter into the Record the resolution recently adopted by the annual conference council, in appreciation of the long years of faithful service rendered by the Reverend Dr. Joe Z Tower.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR JOE Z TOWER

Whereas Joe Z Tower, a greatly beloved and highly esteemed member of the Texas Annual Conference of the South Central Jurisdiction of the Methodist Church, has elected to enter the retired relationship at the forthcoming session of the annual conference; and

Whereas he has served as a skilled servant of the church, a prophetic preacher of the word of God, and a masterly minister to the people of his congregations; and

Whereas Joe Tower, out of a variety of appointments and experiences, has brought to the office of the executive secretary of the Texas conference his winsome personality, his deep convictions and insights, his willingness to be heard, his spontaneous sense of humor, all of his many talents, and his great love for the Methodist Church; and

Whereas he has, with alertness, and boundless energy, delivered in dedicated fashion his invaluable influence, his unique understanding, and his abundant abilities to the conference and its program during these 4 years of service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference council does hereby adopt this resolution this the 13th day of May in the year of our Lord 1964, as an expression of the council's affection and regard for Joe Z Tower, and its appreciation of his outstanding leadership and service as its executive secretary and that copies of this resolution be furnished his wife, Beryl Goodwin Tower, his daughter, Mrs. J. B. Cochran of Fort Worth, Tex. and his son, Senator John Goodwin Tower of Washington, D.C.; and that it be recorded in the minutes of the council.

WAYNE H. McCLESKEY, Chairman,
Mrs. E. MAURICE FAUBION, Secretary,
Mr. JEFF AUSTIN,

Committee on Resolutions.

U.S. POLICY IN REFERENCE TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I answered an unidentified spokesman for the State Department who had given a statement to John Scali, of ABC, in reply to my criticism of State Department policy in southeast Asia that I had made over an ABC telecast.

I understand that the State Department is very unhappy because I pointed out that the rationalizations and alibis and gross misrepresentations of statements of this undisclosed spokesman for the State Department constituted lying to the American people. I repeat it today.

The time has come to call the shots as they are. The continuation of the misrepresentations of the State Department in regard to southeast Asia must be challenged every time an untruthful statement is made.

I inform the Senate that the latest rationalization by the State Department why we cannot take the southeast Asia crisis to the

13212

June 13

United Nations. Mr. President, do you know why it is stated by the State Department that it cannot be done? The State Department's alibi is that it cannot be done because temporarily the United Nations is immobilized, under article 19, due to the fact that France and Russia are in financial arrears. It is alleged that if the General Assembly is called there is an understanding with congressional leaders that the position of the United States will be to challenge the right of France and Russia to vote because they have not paid up their assessments in the United Nations.

If ever I saw an attempt of trying to slide down an escape hatch, this is it. If the southeast Asia issue is brought before the General Assembly of the United Nations, the position of the United States will not be upheld and the State Department knows it. It will not be upheld because this Government is following an illegal course of action in southeast Asia along with South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, and Red China. It is one that cannot be reconciled with the Charter of the United Nations and the Geneva accords of both 1954 and 1962.

As I have said officially to the State Department, I want to say on the floor of the Senate to the State Department, that we ought to call for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the moment Russia vetoes in the Security Council the taking over by the United Nations of jurisdiction over the war going on in southeast Asia. We should take the whole issue first to the Security Council and put Russia on the spot, our illegal policy in southeast Asia is one in which the United States is engaged without a declaration of war having been made by the United States and in which American boys are being killed without justification.

We should first take the southeast Asia crisis to the Security Council of the United Nations and if Russia vetoes our proposal for United Nations jurisdiction we should then take it to the General Assembly and join the freedom-loving nations in establishing a peace-keeping corps in southeast Asia to protect the peace rather than make war.

That is the solution I have been offering for weeks along with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], ably supported by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The State Department should stop lying about our position as its spokesman did to Mr. Seali when sought to leave the impression that we seek to have the United States withdraw from South Vietnam before a SEATO or United Nations peacekeeping corps is sent in. Such a corps is needed to stop warmaking in South Vietnam.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the very fine comments being offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] regarding the State Department.

If he is not careful, he is sending the country back into a republic.

FEDERAL INTERVENTION IN THE COTTON INDUSTRY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Wall Street Journal of June 11, which points out the problems Federal intervention has caused in the cotton industry, and the administrative shortcomings of the Agriculture Department.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON'S CARD GAME

Subsidy, subsidy, who'll get the new cotton subsidy? In a way, it reminds us of that old children's card game of Old Maid. In case you've forgotten, someone winds up with an odd card and this becomes the Old Maid. Rather silly, we suppose, but so is the cotton game.

When the Federal price-support subsidy pushed America's cotton out of the world market, the Government played another card. Specifically, it began paying a subsidy to U.S. exporters so they could compete abroad.

But then foreign textile mills bought this U.S. cotton and processed it into goods they sold to this country. American textile mills, forced to buy their cotton at the higher domestic price, justifiably complained that they were caught in a competitive squeeze play.

Nothing daunted, the Government came up with yet another subsidy, this one designed to help the domestic mills. The trouble was that, by this time, the game had grown so confusing that no one seemed to know who should get the new payment.

About the only thing Congress was sure of was that the payment should not go to the cotton grower, who already received the price-support subsidy. In the end, the lawmakers merely decided to pass the problem along to the Agriculture Department.

That agency, sensibly enough, wasn't anxious to come to grips with the problem either. So it also passed; the solution is now up to the cotton dealers and the textile mills. The Department, however, stipulates that the subsidy will go only to someone who guarantees the cotton will be used by domestic mills or exported—and thus not for profiteering in the market.

As for the textile mills, they're understandably fed up with the cotton game; they would like the dealers to take the subsidy and use it to reduce their prices. But the dealers also understandably, don't want to get any more involved in this childish nonsense than necessary. It therefore looks as though the mills, if they want lower priced cotton, will wind up with the new subsidy themselves.

This new subsidy, the Agriculture Department estimates, will cost the taxpayer \$140 million in the coming year. Once again, it's easy to see who gets the Old Maid's card and loses the game.

SENATOR GOLDWATER NOT AN ISOLATIONIST

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the contention has often been made that our distinguished friend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], is an isolationist.

This, of course, is fatuous nonsense.

An excellent editorial was published in the Arizona Republic on Tuesday, June 9, entitled, "The 'Isolationist.'"

It states in part:

One of the silliest allegations made against Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is that he is an isolationist.

The fact is, as a Life editorial made plain last year, that Senator GOLDWATER long has supported NATO, SEATO, and CENTO, the three principal free world alliances aimed at collectively thwarting our Communist enemy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, June 9, 1964]

THE "ISOLATIONIST"

One of the silliest allegations made against Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is that he is an isolationist.

An editorial in Lord Beaverbrook's London Daily Express, shortly after the Arizonian's victory in the California primary, made that very charge, adding that Britain should not rely on the United States for a nuclear shield "if the Americans were going to elect a President like GOLDWATER."

The fact is, as a Life editorial made plain last year, that Senator GOLDWATER long has supported NATO, SEATO, and CENTO, the three principal free world alliances aimed at collectively thwarting our Communist enemy.

Unlike Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, who advocates an isolationist policy toward Cuba, GOLDWATER claims that we must do everything in our power—tighten the economic boycott already in force, arm and train Cuban exile forces—in an effort to rid the hemisphere of a dangerous enemy. (This position, incidentally, is similarly held by most Republicans in Congress and by many Democrats.)

Unlike Senator WAYNE MORSE, who advocates pulling out of Vietnam and abandoning what's left of that country to the Communists, GOLDWATER believes that the United States should use whatever methods are required to repulse the Vietcong and thereby stave off a Red takeover of southeast Asia.

And, unlike those many Americans who agitated for a coalition government for Laos (with the result that Laos today is communized in all but name), GOLDWATER was one of the few voices in Congress who predicted—correctly—what would happen if the United States foolishly trusted Communist promises.

It is true that GOLDWATER voted against the limited nuclear test ban treaty. He did so saying that if the Soviets were as desirous of reducing international tensions as many treaty supporters claimed, they should demonstrate their sincerity by removing Russian troops from Cuba and by tearing down the Berlin wall. The treaty, of dubious value, passed Congress overwhelmingly, yet the Berlin wall remains standing and Soviet troops remain in Cuba. But, as an administration spokesman admitted last week, America's signature on the test ban treaty now makes it impossible for the United States to construct an Atlantic-Pacific canal (in place of the Panama Canal) by means of nuclear explosives, a process which would save considerable time and money.

Finally, GOLDWATER's "isolation" is sometimes said to stem from his opposition to the direction in which the United Nations is heading. It is foolish to contend that foreign affairs cannot be conducted outside the U.N. when in fact most foreign negotiations already are conducted there. And GOLDWATER is right in suggesting that official Washington change its attitude toward the recklessness of the U.N., that it act as a world leader rather than allowing itself to be led by the immature nations of the world.

GOLDWATER's critics cannot have it both ways. They cannot claim in one breath that he is an isolationist and by charging